

## **Remarks**

**[0001]** Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims of the application. Claims 1-40 are presently pending. Claims amended herein are 1, 7, 9, 11-14, 16, 28, 30, 31, and 36. Claims withdrawn or canceled herein are None. New claims added herein are None. Support for the amendments can be found at least at pages 8-9 and Figs. 1-4 of the Specification as filed.

### **Summary of Interview**

**[0002]** Examiner Mofiz graciously talked with me—the undersigned attorney for the Applicant—on February 16, 2007. Applicant greatly appreciates the Examiners' willingness to talk. Such willingness is invaluable to both of us in our common goal of an expedited prosecution of this patent application.

**[0003]** In that discussion, I explained what I viewed as the differences between the cited art and the claims and discussed possible claim amendments. More specifically, we discussed amending Claim 1 to include associating a Globally Unique Identifier (GUID) with the Web request. In response to a proposed amendment, Examiner Mofiz indicated that an additional search would need to be performed. Applicant appreciates the Examiner's help in expediting the prosecution of this application.

**Formal Request for an Interview**

**[0004]** If the Office's reply to this communication is anything other than allowance of all pending claims, then Applicant formally requests an interview with the Examiner of this patent application. I encourage the Examiner to contact me—the undersigned attorney for the Applicant—to schedule a date and time for a telephone interview that is most convenient for both of us. Please email me at [chrisf@leehayes.com](mailto:chrisf@leehayes.com). Should you contact me by email, please copy my assistant Carly Taylor ([carly@leehayes.com](mailto:carly@leehayes.com)) as well. While email works great for me, I welcome you to call either of us as well.

**Claim Amendments**

**[0005]** Applicant amends claims in accordance with the telephone discussion with the examiner. Such amendments are made to expedite prosecution and quickly identify allowable subject matter.

**Substantive Claim Rejections**

**Double Patenting Claim Rejections**

**[0006]** Claims 1-40 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-20 of co-pending Application No. 11/380858 (*Office Action* p. 2).

**[0007]** Applicant is filing a terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) along with this response to overcome the provisional rejection based on nonstatutory double patenting.

**35 USC § 102 Claim Rejections**

**[0008]** Claims 1-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by pages 1-8 of a non-patent publication entitled "Tracing Overview" 2002 (*hereinafter "Tracing Overview"*) (*Office Action* p. 3).

**[0009]** Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections, and requests reconsideration and allowance in light of the comments and amendments contained herein. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejections be withdrawn and that the case be passed along to issuance.

**[0010]** Claim 1 recites a method comprising:

servicing a Web request from a Web application;  
associating a Globally Unique Identifier (GUID) with the Web request, wherein events which happen during servicing of the Web request can be identified by the GUID which is logged with each of the events;

detecting the occurrence of an event in the servicing of the Web request; and

logging an entry in a trace log, wherein the entry includes:

information descriptive of the occurrence of the event in the servicing of the Web request; and  
the GUID corresponding to the Web request.

**[0011]** In order for Tracing Overview to anticipate this claim, Applicant submits that Tracing Overview must disclose each and every

element and feature of the claim and that they must be arranged in the same manner as the claim. Applicant respectfully submits that Tracing Overview does not disclose all of the claimed elements and features of claim 1. For example, Tracing Overview does not show or disclose "associating a Globally Unique Identifier (GUID) with the Web request, wherein events which happen during servicing of the Web request can be identified by the GUID which is logged with each of the events" as recited in claim 1.

**[0012]** Tracing Overview describes page-level tracing and/or application level tracing (*Tracing Overview*, p.1). Tracing Overview does not describe using a Global Unique Identifier (GUID) context to follow the Web request through the system as described in the current application (*Specification* pp.8-9). For example, if one were to raise the events described in Tracing Overview into a generic tracing system, (*i.e.*, try to trace all execution events that happen during the processing of a Web request) one would not be able to trace/distinguish the events which happen during servicing of the Web request from other events running through the ASP.NET system. Tracing Overview describes tracing ASPN.NET requests within a page or within an application. However, Tracing Overview does not describe using the Global Unique Identifier (GUID) context to trace the events that happened during the servicing of the Web request so as to be able to correlate trace events from one or more applications that interface with a server that services the Web request as well as with events in the server.

**[0013]** There is no description of “associating a Globally Unique Identifier (GUID) with the Web request”, so that “events which happen during servicing of the Web request can be identified by the GUID which is logged with each of the events” as recited in claim 1.

**[0014]** Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable over Tracing Overview for at least these reasons, and Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 rejection be withdrawn.

**[0015]** Claims 2-15 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon claim 1 (either directly or indirectly). Additionally, some or all of claims 2-15 may be allowable over Tracing Overview for independent reasons. For example:

**[0016]** Claim 14 recites, “wherein the GUID is unique to the Web request with respect to other said Web requests, and wherein the GUID is 128bit.” In contrast, Tracing Overview does not describe using a GUID which is unique to the Web request with respect to other said Web requests, and wherein the GUID is 128 bit, as recited in claim 14.

**[0017]** **Claim 16** recites in part:

associating a Globally Unique Identifier (GUID) with a Web request, wherein events which happen during servicing of the Web request can be identified by the GUID which is logged with the events

**[0018]** Applicant respectfully submits that Tracing Overview does not disclose all of the claimed elements and features of claim 16. For reasons similar to those presented above in response to the rejection of claim 1, Tracing Overview does not show or disclose "associating a Globally Unique Identifier (GUID) with a Web request, wherein events which happen during servicing of the Web request can be identified by the GUID which is logged with the events", as recited in claim 16.

**[0019]** Accordingly, claim 16 is allowable over Tracing Overview for at least these reasons, and Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 rejection be withdrawn.

**[0020]** **Claims 17-31** are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon claim 16 (either directly or indirectly). Additionally, some or all of claims 17-31 may be allowable over Tracing Overview for independent reasons. For example:

**[0021]** **Claim 31** recites in part "wherein the Web request GUID is unique to the Web request with respect to other said Web requests, and wherein the Web request is for at least one of: a static file; a Common Gateway Interface (CGI); and an active server page (ASP)". There is no

description of in Tracing Overview of tracing a Web request which is for at least one of: a static file; a Common Gateway Interface (CGI); an active server page (ASP)", as recited in claim 31. Instead, Tracing Overview only describes the tracing of ASP.NET requests.

**[0022]** Claim 32 recites a facility for tracing a Web request on a network, the facility comprising:

identifying means for identifying when a predetermined event occurs in a predetermined Web request when the predetermined Web request is being serviced; and

a logging means, in communication with the identifying means, for logging the event, wherein the log of the event includes:

a GUID corresponding to the predetermined Web request;

information descriptive of the occurrence of the predetermined event when the predetermined Web request is being serviced.

**[0023]** Applicant respectfully submits that Tracing Overview does not disclose all of the claimed elements and features of claim 32. For example, Tracing Overview does not show or disclose," a logging means, in communication with the identifying means, for logging the event, wherein the log of the event includes: a GUID corresponding to the predetermined Web request", as recited in claim 32. As noted previously, there is no description of associating a Globally Unique Identifier (GUID) with the Web request, so that events which happen during servicing of the Web request can be identified by the GUID which is logged with each of the events. Accordingly, Tracing Overview does not show or disclose a logging means...

"for logging the event, wherein the log of the event includes: a GUID corresponding to the predetermined Web request", as recited in claim 32.

**[0024]** Accordingly, claim 32 is allowable over Tracing Overview for at least these reasons, and Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 rejection be withdrawn.

**[0025]** Claim 33 recites a "network environment comprising a server servicing Web requests from a Web application while performing Web request-based tracing to produce traces that include a GUID for each Web request and to flow each GUID from the server across to the Web application."

**[0026]** As noted previously, there is no description of associating a Globally Unique Identifier (GUID) with the Web request. Accordingly, Tracing Overview does not show or disclose a "network environment comprising a server servicing Web requests from a Web application while performing Web request-based tracing to produce traces that include a GUID for each Web request and to flow each GUID from the server across to the Web application", as recited in claim 33.

**[0027]** Claims 34-35 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon claim 33 (either directly or indirectly). Additionally, one or both of claims 34-35 may be allowable over Tracing Overview for independent reasons.

**[0028]** **Claim 36** recites a server module comprising:

logic configured to service a Web request from a Web application;

logic configured to detect an occurrence of an event in the servicing of the Web request; and

logic configured to log an entry in a trace log, wherein the entry includes:

information descriptive of the occurrence of the event in the servicing of the Web request; and

a Globally Unique Identifier (GUID) corresponding to the Web request, wherein the GUID is associated with the Web request, so that events which happen during servicing of the Web request can be identified by the GUID which is logged with each of the events.

**[0029]** Applicant respectfully submits that Tracing Overview does not disclose all of the claimed elements and features of claim 36. For reasons similar to those presented above in response to the rejection of claim 1, Tracing Overview does not show or disclose, "a Globally Unique Identifier (GUID) corresponding to the Web request, wherein the GUID is associated with the Web request, so that events which happen during servicing of the Web request can be identified by the GUID which is logged with each of the events", as recited in claim 36.

**[0030]** **Claims 37-40** are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon claim 36 (either directly or indirectly). Additionally, one or both of claims 37-40 may be allowable over Trading Overview for independent reasons.

### **Dependent Claims**

**[0031]** In addition to its own merits, each dependent claim is allowable for the same reasons that its base claim is allowable. Applicant submits that the Office withdraw the rejection of each dependent claim where its base claim is allowable.

### **Conclusion**

**[0032]** All pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Office is urged to contact the undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 2-15-2007

By:



Chris Fairborn  
Reg. No. 55164  
(509) 324-9256 x249  
[chrisf@leehayes.com](mailto:chrisf@leehayes.com)  
[www.leehayes.com](http://www.leehayes.com)